UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,618	09/04/2003	Young-Chan Kim	1293.1851	5000

21171 7590 06/08/2009

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/654,618	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	STEPHEN G. SHERMAN	2629	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: *1-7, 9-17,20-31,34-44,46-53,55-58*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Amr Awad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Stephen G Sherman/
Examiner, Art Unit 2629

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On pages 12 and 13 of the response the applicant argues that Shaw does not teach of sensing whether an input signal cable is connected because the microprocessor 36 cannot sense whether an input signal cable is connected to the display device, and that Shaw only discloses of determining whether an HSYNC signal is being received, and that thus Shaw only determines whether an HSYNC signal is being received and not the connection or disconnection of a cable. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As explained ni the Final Rejection dated 30 March 2009, the applicant's specification does not explain how an input cable is sensed to be connected but rather only discusses a sync signal being detected and broadly states that it is "sensed" that a cable is connected or not. Thus, as explained by the examiner in the rejection, if a cable is not plugged in then the sync signal will not be present and the signal will be "abnormal" and thus it is "sensed" that a cable is not plugged in as required by the claims. Just because there are other reasons why the signal will be determined "abnormal" doesn't mean that a determination of an abnormal signal when a cable is unplugged doesn't occur. There's no limitation in the claims stating that this is the only way to determine an abnormal signal. Further, the calim is broad and only recites that it need to determine whether a cable is connected, which as explained it does, but no that it detects whether it is disconnected. Thus if the signal is detected, then it is sensed that the cable is detected because the cable has to be plugged in fo rth esignal to be present. The applicant then argues the "decoding" aspect of claim 1 on pages 14 and 15 of the response, however, as explained in the Final Rejection, Shaw does not need to teach this feature because of the "or" recitiation, and further Shaw does determine the "abnormality" by decoding the signal because the sync signal is taken from the signal and thus the signal is decoded. As mentioned above, the applicant's speciifcation states that detecting the sync signal from th signal is how the signal is determined to be abnormal, which is what Shaw does, and thus if the applicant is trying to say now that their invention is something different/more specific then that then the applicant is admitting that 112, first paragraph rejections should be made.